



Application No. 10/790,196

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheets make changes to Figs. 2, 5-8, 9 and 12, and replace the original sheets with Figs. 2, 5-8, 9, 10 and 12.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Figs. 2, 5-8, 9 and 12 are corrected, the Abstract and claims 1 and 3-5 are amended, claims 7-19 are added, and claims 2 and 6 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1 and 3-5 are amended for form. Support for new claims 7 and 14 may be found at least at Fig. 5 and the corresponding description. Support for new claims 8, 15 and 18 may be found in the specification at least at pg. 10, lines 14-21. Support for new claims 9, 16 and 19 may be found in the specification at least at the Abstract. Support for new claims 10 and 17 may be found in the specification at least at Fig. 2 and the corresponding description. Support for new claims 11-13 can be found at least in the subject matter of original claims 3-5, respectively. Figs. 2, 5-8, 9 and 12 are corrected to correct typographical errors. Thus, no new matter is added.

I. Drawings Satisfy All Formal Requirements

The Office Action objects to Figs. 2 and 5-8 for typographical errors. By this Amendment, Figs. 2 and 5-8 are corrected to fix the typographical errors. Thus, Figs. 2 and 5-8 satisfy all formal requirements. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

II. The Abstract Satisfy All Formal Requirements

The Office Action objects to the Abstract because it contains more than 150 words. By this Amendment, the Abstract is amended to be 150 words or less. Thus, the Abstract satisfies all formal requirements. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Claims 1-3 Satisfy All Formal Requirements

The Office Action objects to claims 1-3 for informalities. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the features, "the length" recited on line 9 of claims 1 and 2, "the power supply" recited on line 10 of claims 1 and 2, and "the edge" recited on line 3 of claim 3 lack

antecedent basis. The objection of canceled claim 2 is moot. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 3 are amended accordingly. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

IV. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. Claims 1-3 and 6

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,760,052 to Cummins et al. (Cummins) in view of JP 11066703A to Tanaka et al. (Tanaka). The rejection of canceled claims 2 and 6 is moot, and the rejection of claims 1 and 3 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 3 would not have been rendered obvious by Cummins and Tanaka. Neither of the applied references teaches or suggests a printing device that includes a fixed side structure and a medium conveyance section that moves to a first position, a second position and third position, as recited in independent 1.

Specifically, neither of the applied references, discloses, teaches or suggests "a fixed side structure that supports the medium conveyance section and has a space formed therein for accommodating the medium conveyance section, the fixed side structure including a first side, a second side, and a length between the first side and second side," as recited in independent claim 1. Further, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests that "the medium conveyance section is at a second position so as to project partially from the first side of the fixed side structure, when workpiece is set on, or removed from, the medium conveyance section; and wherein during a printing operation onto the workpiece, the medium conveyance section is controlled so as to move along the length from the second position where it projects partially from the first side of the fixed side structure to a third position where it projects partially from the second side, and then return again to the second position where it projects partially from the first side," as recited in independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

For example, the first position, the second position and the third position of the medium conveyance correspond to the storage position, setting/removing position and the position immediately prior to printing, shown in Figs. 2, 5 and 6, and 7, respectively. As shown in Fig. 2, the medium conveyance section is at a first position (the storage position) so as to be within the length of the fixed side structure, when a power supply to the device is in an off state. As shown in Figs. 5 and 6, the medium conveyance section is at a second position (the setting/removing position) so as to project partially from the first side of the fixed side structure. As shown in Fig. 7, the medium conveyance is at a third position (the position immediately prior to printing) so as to project partially from the second side of the fixed side structure.

Cummins only discloses a tray 22 that is either open, moving outwardly from the housing 23, or closed, moving inwardly toward the housing 23, as shown in Fig. 2. At either position, the tray 22 of Cummins completely projects from the frame 12, which the Office Action alleges corresponds to the fixed sided structure. In fact, the tray 22 of Cummins is not within the frame 12 at either position. Thus, Cummins does not disclose a medium conveyance section that projects partially from the first and/or second side of the fixed side structure, i.e., second and third positions, as recited in independent claims 1 and 2.

Further, Tanaka does not remedy the deficiencies of Cummins. Tanaka is cited by the Office Action for only its alleged teaching of a medium conveyance section that is positioned within the length of the fixed side structure, when a power supply to the device is in an off state. Tanaka does not disclose a printing device that includes a fixed side structure and a medium conveyance section that moves to a second position and third position or fixed sided structure. Thus, Tanaka does not remedy the deficiencies of Cummins.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is patentable over Cummins and Tanaka. Further, claim 3, which depends from claim 1, is also patentable over Cummins and

Tanaka, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully note that the Office Action only provided an English translation of the Abstract to support its assertion that Tanaka discloses a device that includes a medium conveyance section in the Abstract and as shown in Figs. 4 and 5. MPEP §706.02II states that "when an Abstract is used to support a rejection, the evidence relied upon is the facts contained in the Abstract, not additional facts that may be contained in the underlying full text document." The description of Figs. 4 and 5 is not included in the Abstract of Tanaka, but in the full text of Tanaka. Because Tanaka is in a language other than English and the Examiner seeks to rely on the document (not just the Abstract), the Examiner must provide a full English translation of Tanaka in the next Office Action so that the precise facts the Examiner is relying upon in support of the rejection is clear.

B. Claims 4 and 5

The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Cummins in view of Tanaka and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,444 to Drynkin et al. (Drynkin). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4 and 5 would not have been rendered obvious by Cummins in view of Tanaka and further in view of Drynkin. Drynkin does not remedy the deficiencies of Cummins and Tanaka discussed above with respect to claim 1. Drynkin is cited by the Office Action for only its alleged teaching of a cover. Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 4 and 5 are patentable over Drynkin for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Date: October 30, 2006

Attachments:

Amended Abstract
Replacement Sheets

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--